

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated October 14, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claims 29 and 37 have been amended, and claims 36 and 46 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 29, 31, 33-35, 37-38, 40, 42-45 and 47 are pending in the application with claim 47 being withdrawn from consideration. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 29, 31, 33, 34, 37, 38, 40 and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,351,300, issued to Park et al. (hereafter “Park”) in view of U.S. Patent no. 6,014,190, issued to Kim et al. (hereafter “Kim”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,122,030, issued to Nagata, et al. (hereafter “Nagata”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because neither Park, Kim nor Nagata, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Park, Kim and Nagata fail to teach or suggest an in-plane switching liquid crystal display device that includes, “a capacitor electrode overlapping the common line and connected to the pixel electrodes via a contact hole, wherein the capacitor electrode and common line form a storage capacitor having the first insulating layer therebetween” as recited in independent claim 29 of the present application.

Park, Kim and Nagata further fail to teach or suggest a method of fabricating an in-plane switching liquid crystal display device that includes, among other features, “forming a capacitor electrode overlapping the common line and electrically connected to the pixel electrodes via a contact hole, wherein the capacitor electrode and common line form a storage capacitor having the first insulating layer therebetween” as recited in independent claim 37 of the present application.

The Office Action concedes that Park fails to teach all the features recited in the claims of the present application. To remedy the deficient teachings of Park, the Office Action

relies upon Kim and Nagata. Applicant respectfully submits Kim and Nagata fail to remedy the deficient teachings of Park. Specifically, Kim discloses an IPS liquid crystal display in which “each pixel has two longitudinal common electrodes 121 overlapped with the data line 130, four longitudinal pixel electrodes 140 arranged between the common electrodes 140, arranged between the common electrodes 121, and two two-channel TFTs” (Col. 4, lines 62-65). And, Nagata discloses a twisted nematic (TN) mode liquid crystal display in which “an organic polymer thin film such as acrylic resin is used as the insulating film” (Col. 2, lines 6-8). However, Kim and Nagata fail to teach or suggest an in-plane switching liquid crystal display device including “a capacitor electrode overlapping the common line and connected to the pixel electrodes via a contact hole, wherein the capacitor electrode and common line form a storage capacitor having the first insulating layer therebetween” as recited in independent claim 29 of the present application.

Kim and Nagata further fail to teach a method of fabricating an in-plane switching liquid crystal display device that includes, “forming a capacitor electrode overlapping the common line and electrically connected to the pixel electrodes via a contact hole, wherein the capacitor electrodes and common line form a storage capacitor having the first insulating layer therebetween” as recited in independent claim 37 of the present application.

Because neither Park, Kim nor Nagata teach the above features of independent claims 29 and 37, no combination of Park, Kim and Nagata would provide an in-plane switching liquid crystal display device and method of fabricating an in-plane switching liquid crystal display device having the combined features recited in independent claims 29 and 37. Accordingly, independent claim 29 and its dependent claims 31, 33, and 34, and independent claim 37 and its dependent claims 38, 40 and 42-44 are allowable over any combination of Park, Kim and Nagata. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 35 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park, Kim and Nagata, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,414,729, issued to Akiyama et al. (hereafter “Akiyama”). And, claims 36 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park, Kim, Nagata and further in view of Michibayashi et al. (hereafter “Michibayashi”). Claims 36 and 46 have been cancelled without

prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections because neither Park, Kim, Nagata, Akiyama nor Michibayashi, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Park, Kim, Nagata, Akiyama and Michibayashi fail to teach or suggest “a capacitor electrode overlapping the common line and connected to the pixel electrodes via a contact hole, wherein the capacitor electrode and common line form a storage capacitor having the first insulating layer therebetween”, as recited in independent claim 29, from which claim 35 depends.

Park, Kim, Nagata, Akiyama and Michibayashi further fail to teach or suggest a method of fabricating an in-plane switching liquid crystal display device that includes “forming a capacitor electrode overlapping the common line and electrically connected to the pixel electrodes via a contact hole, wherein the capacitor electrode and common line form a storage capacitor having the first insulating layer therebetween” as recited in independent claim 37, from which claim 45 depends.

Applicant respectfully submits Akiyama and Michibayashi fail to remedy the deficient teachings of Park, Kim and Nagata discussed above such that any combination of Park, Kim, Nagata, Akiyama and Michibayashi would provide a in-plane switching liquid crystal display device and method of fabricating including all the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. Because no combination of Park, Kim, Nagata, Akiyama and Michibayashi teaches the combined features recited in the claims of the present application, claim 29 and its dependent claim 35, and claim 37 and its dependent claim 45 are allowable over Park, Kim, Nagata, Akiyama and Michibayashi. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: January 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes

Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant